



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,505	09/15/2003	Kazuko Kirihara	117187	7418
25944	7590	09/16/2008	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				WOLDEMARIAM, AKILILU K
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2624		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/16/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/661,505	KIRIHARA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	AKLILU K. WOLDEMARIAM	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2008.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/04/2008, 09/27/2007, 02/02/2006, 11/03/2003</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 05/30/2008 has been entered. Claims 1-9 are still pending, with claims 1, 4 and 7 being independent.
2. Non-final rejection that was sent on 03/04/2008 is withdrawn in view of new ground rejection.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 06/04/2008 was filed after the mailing date of 06/04/2008. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim limitation, "sets processing order of the plurality of service processes so that they will be executed serially a/or in parallel." This claim limitation does not have three separate embodiments (for example and, or and,

and/or) to enable the claim limitation, as described in original specification, (see, paragraph [0008], [0011] and [0012]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. *Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estrada et al., "Estrada" (US Publication number 2003/0142126 A1) in view of Kenichi (Japan publication number 2001-216452).*

Regarding claim 1, *Estrada discloses a service processing apparatus (see fig.3) comprising:*

*a setting unit that sets at least a location of processing document data (see items 307 and 312, fig.31 and paragraph [0225] setting documents) and a content of a plurality of service processes to be executed on the document data, and sets processing order of the plurality of service processes so that they will be executed serially an/or in parallel (see fig.33 and paragraph [0229] program referred to executing) and;*

*a generating unit that generates, on the basis of a content of settings made by the setting unit, instruction data to be used for executing the plurality of service processes on file document data in the processing order set by the setting unit (see fig.34 and fig.35, paragraph [0249] and [0250] file documents);*

a plurality of service processing apparatuses connected to a network execute the plurality of service processes on the document data in a cooperative manner (see fig.13, fig.33 and paragraph [0229] processing).

Estrada does not disclose an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data; and a cooperative processing unit that makes, on the basis of interpretation results of the interpreting unit.

However, Kenichi discloses an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data (see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction); and a cooperative processing unit that makes, on the basis of interpretation results of the interpreting unit (see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction).

It would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to use Kenichi's an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data in Estrada's a service processing apparatus because it will allow to interpret the instruction in accordance with predetermined application interface agreement, *[Kenichi, see paragraph[0029]]*.

Regarding claim 2, *Estrada discloses the service processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising:*

*a judging unit that judges whether each of the plurality of service processes is executable (see paragraph [0152] Open form handler 167 determines that the command is for the ACME place, for its top room Main.nsf, and using the pageUI form); and*

a processing unit that makes, if a service process is judged unexcitable by file judging unit, a service processing apparatus in charge of the unexcitable service execute a predetermined executable service process (see paragraph [0181])

*Alternatively, the user could have selected other options which would result in execution of other commands 229, such as create user, and so forth).*

Regarding claim 3, *Kenichi discloses the service processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising a rewriting unit that rewrites the instruction data so that service processes that are currently defined as being executed serially will be executed in parallel when the service processes that are to be executed serially in the processing order can be executed in parallel (see paragraph [0005] service of plurality [processes/ a series of / operating ], and since it was specifically built on application (application program)).*

Regarding claim 4, *Estrada discloses a processing service method comprising: setting at least a location of processing document data (see items 307 and 312, fig.31 and paragraph [0225] setting documents) and a content of a plurality of service processes to be executed on the document data (see fig.33 and paragraph [0229] program referred to executing), and setting processing order of the plurality of service processes so that they will be executed serially and/or parallel generating, on the basis of a content of settings made in the setting step, instruction data to be used for executing the plurality of service processes on the document data in the processing order set in the setting step (see fig.34 and fig.35, paragraph [0249] and [0250] file documents);*

a plurality of service processing apparatuses connected to a network execute the plurality of service on the document data in a cooperative manner (see fig.13, fig.33 and paragraph [0229] processing).

Estrada does not disclose interpreting a content of the instruction data; and making, on the basis of interpretation results in the interpreting step,

However, Kenichi discloses interpreting a content of the instruction data (see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction); and

making, on the basis of interpretation results in the interpreting step (see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction).

It would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to use Kenichi's an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data in Estrada's a service processing apparatus because it will allow to interpret the instruction in accordance with predetermined application interface agreement, *[Kenichi, see paragraph[0029]]*.

Regarding claim 5, *Estrada discloses* the service processing method according to claim 4, further comprising:

judging whether each of the plurality Of service processes is executable(see fig. 26 and paragraph [0152] *Open form handler 167 determines that the command is for the ACME place, for its top room Main.nsf, and using the pageUI form*); and making, if a service process is judged unexcitable, a service processing apparatus in charge of the unexcitable service process execute a predetermined executable service process (see

*fig.14 and paragraph [0181] Alternatively, the user could have selected other options which would result in execution of other commands 229, such as create user, and so forth).*

Regarding claim 6, *Kenichi discloses the service processing method according to claim 4, further comprising rewriting the instruction data so that service processes that are currently defined as being executed serially will be executed in parallel when the service processes that are to be executed serially in the processing order can be executed in parallel ((see paragraph [0005] service of plurality [processes/a series of / operating], and since it was specifically built on application (application program)).*

Regarding claim 7, *Estrada discloses a service processing apparatus comprising:*

*a setting unit that sets at least a location of processing document data (see items 307 and 312, fig.31 and paragraph [0225] setting documents); and a content of a plurality of service processes to be executed on the document data (see fig.33 and paragraph [0229] program referred to executing), and a generating unit that generates, on the basis of a content of settings made by the setting unit, instruction data to be used for executing the plurality of service processes on the document data in the processing order set by the setting unit(see fig.34 and fig.35, paragraph [0249] and [0250] file documents); and*

*a sending unit that sends the instruction data to a service processing apparatus for executing a next service process after the process executing unit has finished*

execution of the service process (see *item 307, fig.31 and paragraph [0225] server sends new set of instructions to browser to represent document*).

Estrada does not disclose sets processing order of the plurality of service processes so that they will be executed serially and/or in parallel;  
an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data.  
a process executing unit that executes a service process on the document data on the basis of interpretation results of the interpreting unit.

However, Kenichi discloses sets processing order of the plurality of service processes so that they will be executed serially and/or in parallel (see *paragraph [0005] service of plurality [processes/ a series of / operating], and since it was specifically built on application (application program)*);

an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data (see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction);  
a process executing unit that executes a service process on the document data on the basis of interpretation results of the interpreting unit (see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction);

It would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to use Kenichi's an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data in Estrada's a service processing apparatus because it will allow to interpret the instruction in accordance with predetermined application interface agreement, [*Kenichi, see paragraph[0029]*].

Regarding claim 8, Estrada discloses the service processing apparatus to claim 7 further comprising:

a judging unit that judges whether the service process is executable (see *fig. 26 and paragraph [0152] Open form handler 167 determines that the command is for the ACME place, for its top room Main.nsf, and using the pageUI form*); and

a processing unit that executes a predetermined executable service process if the service process is judged unexcitable by the judging unit (see *fig.14 and paragraph [0181] Alternatively, the user could have selected other options which would result in execution of other commands 229, such as create user, and so forth*).

Regarding claim 9, *Estrada discloses a service processing method comprising:*  
*setting at least a location of processing document data and a content of a plurality of service processes to be executed on the document data see items 307 and 312, fig.31 and paragraph [0225] setting documents*) , and  
*generating, on the basis of a content of settings made in the setting step, instruction data to be used for executing the plurality of service processes on the document data in the in g order set in the setting step (see fig.34 and fig.35, paragraph [0249] and [0250] file documents)* ; and  
*sending the instruction data to a service processing apparatus for executing a next service process after the process executing step has finished execution of the service process (see item 307, fig.31 and paragraph [0225] server sends new set of instructions to browser to represent document)*.

Estrada does not disclose setting processing order of the plurality of service processes so that they will be executed serially and/or in parallel; interpreting a content of the instruction data; and executing a service process on the document data on the basis of interpretation results in the interpreting step.

However, Kenichi disclose setting processing order of the plurality of service processes so that they will be executed serially and/or in parallel (*see paragraph [0005] service of plurality [ processes/ a series of / operating ], and since it was specifically built on application (application program))*;

interpreting a content of the instruction data (*see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction*);

executing a service process on the document data on the basis of interpretation results in the interpreting step (*see paragraph [00029] 1st interface section has desirably the function to interpret the instruction*).

It would have been obvious to ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to use Kenichi's an interpreting unit that interprets a content of the instruction data in Estrada's a service processing apparatus because it will allow to interpret the instruction in accordance with predetermined application interface agreement, [*Kenichi, see paragraph[0029]*].

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 05/30/2008 have been respectfully considered. Claim inventions are rejected under new ground of rejection. Therefore the arguments are moot.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AKLILU k. WOLDEMARIAM whose telephone number is (571)270-3247. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30 a.m-5:00 p.m EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samir Ahmed can be reached on 571-272-7413. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Samir Ahmed,  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2624

A.W.  
Examiner, Art Unit 2624  
09/11/2008

/Samir A. Ahmed/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624